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Agenda

- **Introduction**: Evaluating ST8 at local and state levels.
- **Background**: Why evaluate SNAP-Ed coalition capacity?
- **Methods**: How Arizona evaluated coalitions’ capacity.
- **Results**: Coalitions’ scores in FY16.
- **Implications**: How results have been used to strengthen coalition capacity.
- **Conclusions & Reflections**
**Similar names, similar jobs?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laurel Jacobs</th>
<th>Lauren McCullough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong> Implementing Agency (Evaluator)</td>
<td><strong>Local</strong> Implementing Agency (Program Manager)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develops</strong> SNAP-Ed Evaluations</td>
<td><strong>Implements</strong> SNAP-Ed Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analyzes</strong> data</td>
<td><strong>Collects</strong> data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports findings to state, national, and other stakeholders</td>
<td>Translates findings to local and community stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sometimes still get phone calls for the other person...**
Background

Public Health Approaches (PHAs)

Direct Education (DE)

Policy, Systems, and Environment (PSEs)

Socio-Ecological Model

Public Policy

Community (cultural values, norms)

Schools (environment, ethos)

Interpersonal (social network)

Individual (knowledge, attitude, skills)

ST8

PSEs

DE
Background

Evaluating Coalitions - ST8

- Short-term: Capacity
- Medium-term: Changes
- Long-term: Impacts
Methods

Coalition Types:  
- Food Systems
- Active Living
- Both
Coalition Participation in Evaluation

- Partnered with SNAP-Ed in Food Systems and Active Living work
- Multi-sectoral coalitions (Five or more organizations involved)
- Existed for six+ months
- Qualified for assessment
The Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory

- 40 Questions on Likert Scale (1.0 – 5.0)
- Validated
- Anonymous, Brief (15 minutes)
- Online or Paper-Based
- Measured 20 collaboration Success Factors
Coalition Success Factors

- Members see collaboration in their self-interest.
  - This benefits us.

- Unique Purpose:
  - No other organization is doing this.

- Sufficient funds, staff, materials, and time:
  - We have funding!
What is the Wilder Inventory?

The Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory is a research-tested assessment that allows members of a coalition to evaluate the strengths and areas for improvement within their coalition, such as history of collaboration or cooperation in the community, appropriate cross section of members; and concrete, attainable goals and objectives.

To learn more: https://www.wilder.org/Research/Research-Services/Papers/Wilder-Collaboration-Factors-Inventory.aspx

Why is my coalition invited to participate?

A member of your coalition is funded by the Arizona Nutrition Network (SNAP-Ed), which is charged with implementing public health approaches to prevent obesity and reduce health disparities. As part of SNAP-Ed's evaluation framework, coalitions implementing Food Systems and Active Living strategies in Arizona are invited to participate.

What are the benefits of participating?

After coalition members have participated in the anonymous online or paper-based survey, your coalition will receive: 1) a summary of scores for each of the 20 success factors, 2) personalized recommendations from the Arizona Nutrition Network Evaluation Team on coalition strengths and potential weaknesses, and 3) open-ended survey comments from respondents. Members can use these results to work on improvements as appropriate for the coalition's mission, vision and goals.
### Participation

**Wilder Surveys Distributed and Completed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th># Distributed</th>
<th># Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coconino</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohave</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinal</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavapai</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>222</strong></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Data Analysis

### Scoring

#### Collaboration Strengths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0 – 5.0</td>
<td>Doesn’t need attention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Collaboration Areas for Concern/Attention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0 – 3.9</td>
<td>Borderline, Deserve Discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Collaboration Weaknesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 – 2.9</td>
<td>Concerns that should be addressed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results – All Coalitions (N=10)

**Success Factor Averages**

- **Highest**
  - Collaboration in their self-interest: 4.3
  - Skilled Leadership: 4.1
  - Unique purpose: 4.1
  - Favorable climate: 4.1

Success Factor Scores:

- 4.0 to 5.0
Results – All Coalitions

Lowest Success Factor Averages

- Clear roles and responsibilities: 3.3
- Appropriate cross section of members: 3.3
- Sufficient funds, staff, materials, time: 2.8

Success Factor Scores: 2.0, 3.0, 4.0
Analyzing Results

- Coalition Focus
- Rural v. Urban
- Size
- Other?
- SNAP-Ed Involvement
- Coalition Maturity
### Rural (N=4) and Urban (N=6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Rural Coalitions</th>
<th>Urban Coalitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate Cross Section of Members</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members Share Stake in Outcomes</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete, Attainable Goals &amp; Objectives</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient Staff, Funds, Materials, &amp; Time</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaker Success Factors</td>
<td>Score (out of 5)</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sufficient funds, staff, materials and time:</em></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>• Are there creative workarounds to increase your coalition’s capacity, such as exploring student intern or volunteer hours?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The collaborative group has an adequate, consistent financial base, along with the staff and materials needed to support its operations. It allows sufficient time to achieve its goals and includes time to nurture the collaboration.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Does your coalition structure provide formal or informal times for members to network and develop relationships?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Members share a stake in both process and outcome</em></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>• Is there a coalition member who has the resources to contribute a small portion of staff time to advance the coalition?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Are there opportunities for joint development or revision of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Study: Healthy South Tucson

Highest and Lowest Success Factor Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success Factors</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration in their self-interest</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stake in both process and outcome</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient funds, staff, materials, time</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Success Factor Scores

- **Weak:** ≤ 2.9
- **Needs Attention:** 3.0-3.9
- **Strong:** ≥ 4.0
Case Study

How the Results and Recommendations were used:

- Members share stake in process and outcome
- Sufficient, funds, staff, materials and time
Other Arizona Coalitions’ Action Steps

Active Living Coalition in Large Urban County
- Discussed accomplishments, strengths & weaknesses using Wilder results
- Action steps developed for a more specific work plan with clearer objectives & accountability
- Wilder Inventory was helpful in moving members to be more structured in their approach

Food Systems Coalition in Large Urban County
- Working to address the weaker success factors using Wilder results
- Will charge membership dues to address resource constraints. Paying members will have voting rights.
- Open house planned to re-engage existing and invite new members.
Wilder Next Steps

- Assess coalitions again in two years (FY18)
- Measure changes across time
- Share results
- Link coalition factors with community-level PSE outcomes
Conclusions & Reflections

1. Assess the coalition
2. Share results with coalition members
3. Implement changes to strengthen capacity
4. Changes and impacts in food systems and active living
ST8 and Wilder Resources:

To learn more about Arizona’s evaluation of ST8 using Wilder:
https://nutritioneval.arizona.edu/results

To learn more about the WCFI:

To learn more about the SNAP-Ed Framework Logic Model and Interpretative Guide:
Arizona’s Other SNAP-Ed Evaluations

Food Systems
- STORE healthy retail tool
- Summer Food Checklist

Active Living
- PARA tool assesses physical activity resources

School Health
- WellSAT 2.0: written LWPs
- NSHAC: LWP implementation

Early Childhood
- Go NAP SACC assesses childcare PSEs

Direct Education
- KAN-Q: youth
- UC Davis surveys: adults

Blue: Developed by Evaluation Team
Black: Existing tools